

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,855	09/30/2005	Samantha Jones	360.8178USU	4410
27623 7590 12/16/2008 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			LIN, KUANG Y	
STAMFORD, CT 06901			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/523 855 JONES, SAMANTHA Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Kuang Y. Lin 1793 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-4.6-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 10/523,855

Art Unit: 1793

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be needlived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 3.894,572 to Moore.

Moore shows a method for forming a shell mold. The method comprises steps of (a) dipping a disposable pattern in a bath comprising a sol of positive charged colloidal particles of an inorganic substance to form a coating on the pattern surface; (b) applying to the surface a particulate refractory material containing a chemical setting agent, said setting agent includes polyfunctional organic and inorganic acids and their salts; and (c) repeating step (a) and (b) as required to build a refractory laminate of the desired thickness (see, col. 2, line 51 through col. 3, line 4).

Moore further states that the organic moiety to which the plurality of acid functional groups are attached can be polymeric. An unsaturated hydrocarbon containing one of the groups can be homopolymerized or copolymerized with other suitable monomers; thus, methacrylic acid can be polymerized alone or with ethylene. Suitable comonomers for this invention include methyl methacrylate, ethyl acrylate, maleate acrylamide or mathacrylamide. (col. 9, line 50 through col. 10, line 6). Classes of polymers which are particularly effective in

Application/Control Number: 10/523,855

Art Unit: 1793

practicing this invention are the homopolymers and copolymers of acrylic acid and methacrylic acid (col.10, lines 16-18).

From the teaching of Moore described above it would have been obvious that in the step (b) of shell mold forming method the setting agent includes polyacrylamide or polyacrylate.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1446, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3,73(b).

4. Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/587,425. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed disclosure of the copending application discloses the invention as claimed.

Art Unit: 1793

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

 Applicant's arguments filed December 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant in page 8, 3rd para, and page 10, 2nd paragraph of the response stated that the gel-forming agent ('setting agent') in the Moore patent acts through electrostatic/chemical interaction of the negatively-charged setting agent with the positively-charged colloidal binder particles and there is no disclosure in Moore patent of absorption of moisture by the gel forming material. However, as stated supra, the chemical setting agent used by Moore is selected from the group consisting of (1) organic or inorganic bases, (2) monofunctional organic acids and their salts having an anionic portion containing at least one alkyl group of from 6 to about 24 non-carboxyl carbon atoms per acid function group, (3) polyfunctional organic and inorganic acids and their salts, and (4) negatively charged colloidal particles of an inorganic substance (col. 2, line 56 through col. 3, line2). Thus, the negatively charged colloidal particles is only one of the chemical setting agent can be used in the process of Moore. Further, as stated in para. 2 supra, since it would have been obvious to use polyacrylamide or polyacrylate as setting agent in the Moore process, those setting agent would perform the moisture absorbing function.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the Application/Control Number: 10/523,855

Art Unit: 1793

grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179.
 The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica L. Ward can be reached on 571-272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/523,855 Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kuang Y. Lin/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

12-11-08